

## **REMARKS**

### 1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action of June 22, 2007. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application, and amendments are made in the present response to add clarifying language to the claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### 2. Telephone Interview Summary

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Vu spent with Applicants' Attorney, Mr. Charles W. Griggers, during a telephone discussion on September 13, 2007 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During the discussion, proposed amendments and arguments were discussed regarding the outstanding rejection (which are contained herein). The Examiner indicated that the selection of a profile in *Beaton* involves directing a service for the profile to assume an active state. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that the features of the pending claims are distinguishable over *Beaton*, and therefore, respectfully request the Examiner to consider the present response.

### 3. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Beaton* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0075305).

#### a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A communications system, comprising:  
a first communication suite comprising:  
    a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service; and  
    at least one communications account of the first user for a second communications service;  
first logic configured to recognize that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and

***second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Further, *Beaton* does not describe different levels or modes of operations for services being in an active state or an inactive state with regard to which profile is actively being used.

As such, *Beaton* fails to teach or suggest at least “second logic configured to direct the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-6

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-6 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 7

As provided in independent claim 7, Applicants claim:

A system for integrating communications services, comprising:

a first communication suite profile having a first plurality of communications services, wherein a particular user has a respective communications account for each of the first plurality of communications services; and

first logic configured to:

determine if the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user;

***upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and***

***upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service,***

***wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Further, *Beaton* does not describe different levels or modes of operations for services being in an active state or

an inactive state with regard to which profile is actively being used. Also, selection of a profile in *Beaton* is not analogous to actively requesting a communication service, as described in the claim.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* fails to teach or suggest “upon a determination that the particular user is actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an active state of service; and upon a determination that the particular user is not actively requesting one of the first plurality of communications services via said respective communications account of the particular user, directing said each of the first plurality of communications services to initiate an inactive state of service, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services operate at an active level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at an inactive level of service that provides reduced functionality than the active level of service,” as recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7, and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 8-13

For at least the reasons given above, claim 7 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 8-13 depend from claim 7 and recite additional features, claims 8-13 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 14

As provided in independent claim 14, Applicants claim:

A communications system, comprising:

means for providing a first communication suite having a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service and at least one communications account of the first user for the second communications service;

means for recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and

***means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Further, *Beaton* does not describe different levels or modes of operations for services being in an active state or an inactive state with regard to which profile is actively being used. Also, selection of a

profile in *Beaton* is not analogous to recognizing that a communication service is being actively utilized, as described in the claim.

As such, *Beaton* fails to teach or suggest “means for directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the first logic recognizes that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user is being actively utilized, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 14.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 14, and the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 15-16

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 15-16 depend from claim 14 and recite additional features, claims 15-16 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

f. Claim 17

As provided in independent claim 17, Applicants claim:

A method for integration communications services, comprising:  
providing a suite of communications services having at least one first communications account of a user for a first communications service and at least one second communications account of the user for a second communications service; and

***directing each communications service of the user in the suite to initiate an active state of service via the communications accounts if the user is actively utilizing any communications account in the suite.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “directing each communications service of the user in the suite to initiate an active state of service via

the communications accounts if the user is actively utilizing any communications account in the suite,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 17.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Also, selection of a profile in *Beaton* is not analogous to recognizing that a communication service is being actively utilized, as described in the claim.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17, and the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

g. Claims 18-20

For at least the reasons given above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and recite additional features, claims 18-20 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

h. Claim 21

As provided in independent claim 21, Applicants claim:

A method for integrating communications services, comprising:  
providing a first association of a plurality of first communications accounts for a first communications service;

providing a second association of a plurality of second communications accounts for a second communications service;

***detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association;***



***upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and***

***upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Further, *Beaton* does not describe different levels or modes of operations for services being in an active state or

an inactive state with regard to which profile is actively being used. Also, selection of a profile in *Beaton* is not analogous to actively utilizing a communication service, as described in the claim.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* fails to teach or suggest “detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 21.

Accordingly, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 21, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

i. Claims 22-23

For at least the reasons given above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and recite additional features, claims 22-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

j. Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicants claim:

A communications method, comprising:

providing a first communication suite having a plurality of communications accounts of a first user for a first communications service and at least one communications account of the first user for the second communications service;

***recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and***

***directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the recognizing step, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services***

***operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service, the first communications service and the second communications service being able to assume either an active or inactive state.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Beaton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “recognizing that one of the plurality of communications accounts of the first user for the first communications service is being actively utilized; and directing the second communications service to assume an active state of service for the first user after the recognizing step, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service, the first communications service and the second communications service being able to assume either an active or inactive state” as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Beaton* describes a graphical user interface adapted to facilitate collaboration between team members, where the graphical user interface provides preference and presence information concerning each member of the team to other members. See para. 0014. A team member can select a profile which provides to other team members communication preferences for the team member. For example, if a user selects an office profile, the communication devices that the user prefers to receive communications, such as an office computer, office telephone, *etc.* are provided to the other team members. See para. 0073. In *Beaton*, a user’s cell phone or pager could be included as a preferred method of communication for more than one profile, such as “office” and “home.” Therefore, recognition that the user’s pager is being actively utilized does not indicate to which profile is active or to what other devices associated with the active profile should assume an active state. Further, *Beaton* does not describe different levels or modes of operations for services being in an active state or an inactive state with regard to which profile is actively being used. Also, selection of a profile in *Beaton* is not analogous to actively utilizing a communication service, as described in the claim.

For at least these reasons, *Beaton* fails to teach or suggest “detecting if a particular user is actively utilizing one of the first communications accounts in the first association; upon detection, initiating an active state of service for each first communications account in the first association; and upon detection, initiating an inactive state of service for each second communications account in the second association, wherein for an active state of service, the communications services of the first communications suite operate at a first level of service and for an inactive state of service, the communications services operate at a second level of service that provides reduced functionality than the first level of service,” as recited in claim 24.

Accordingly, *Beaton* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 24, and the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

k. Claims 25-26

For at least the reasons given above, claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 25-26 depend from claim 24 and recite additional features, claims 25-26 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

### **CONCLUSION**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500